

***Village of Barrington  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes Summary***

Date: February 4, 2003

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Patricia Pokorski, Chair, Zoning Board of Appeals  
Ralph Bartlett, ZBA  
Robert Henehan, ZBA  
Ryan Julian, ZBA  
Bruce Kramer, ZBA  
Victoria Perille, ZBA  
Peg Moston, ZBA

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director of Building & Planning  
Keith Sbiral, Planner  
Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

***Call to Order***

Chair Patricia Pokorski called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. Roll Call noted the following: Patricia Pokorski, Chair, present; Ralph Bartlett, present; Robert Henehan, present; Ryan Julian present; Bruce Kramer, present; Victoria Perille, present; and Peg Moston, present. There being a quorum established, the meeting proceeded.

***Old Business***

Ms. Pokorski swore in anyone who would be testifying including Mr. Sbiral and Mr. Wallace. Ms. Pokorski announced that the order of agenda would change.

**Public Hearings.**

**ZBA 02-14 Barrington Services Group (330 East Main Street) Variation**

Petitioner requested to continue the hearing to the April 15, 2003 meeting. Mr. Julian moved and Mr. Henehan seconded to continue hearing to the April 15, 2003 meeting. Roll Call noted the following: Patricia Pokorski, Chair, yes; Ralph Bartlett, yes; Robert Henehan, yes; Ryan Julian yes; Bruce Kramer, yes; Victoria Perille, yes; and Peg Moston, yes. Motion carried.

**ZBA 02-13 Flubacker Appeal (Appeal of a Zoning Interpretation)**

Mr. Wallace gave an overview. Mr. Wallace discussed a meeting with petitioner regarding the property at 407 East Main Street. In the course of that discussion and a couple times since October 22, 2002; Mr. Wallace gave an interpretation of how the proposed project fit into Zoning Ordinance. Some of the points discussed were the determination of first story, parking structures, and gross square footage. It was the interpretation of these points that was being appealed.

The petitioner, Mr. Flubacker, asked a question about the length of time.

Ms. Pokorski said 15 minutes was allowed for petitioner, then Mr. Wallace would have up to 15 minutes, and then Mr. Flubacker would have another 15 minutes to rebut. The matter would then reside with the Zoning Board of Appeals. Then the public would be permitted to comment.

The petitioner Mr. Ronald Flubacker was the architect of record, and he was appealing zoning interpretation of plans for the proposed structure at 407 E. Main Street.

The petitioner explained the scope of the project. Mr. Flubacker said he did not know that there was a time limit on his presentation. Mr. Flubacker also introduced Jeff Westergard, an investor and developer, and Charles Crook, a planner, who had been employed by the Village of Lake Forest as their Director of Community Development, and who had done extensive work in this area.

Mr. Flubacker said he did not want to frighten the board with the size of his handout, but he wanted one package, that contained all the information. Mr. Flubacker also had a 6 or 7-page letter, and a 2-page letter from Chuck Crook. Mr. Flubacker said that they began in late summer, and the project had been changed several times. It was brought before the Architectural Review Commission and was approved.

Mr. Flubacker felt there were some core things including how he saw the Zoning Ordinance as an architect. First, Mr. Flubacker thought it was written for him, and was a tool created by the Village for architects. It should be clear so that rules were followed. Mr. Flubacker relished a clear document with no abstractions. When there was an ambiguity in document, it hurt the process. Mr. Flubacker did not want any misunderstandings. Mr. Flubacker listed the point which was not in dispute: the project was located in the B-4 Village Center zoning district. The proposed project was on a through lot and had front and rear streets with Main Street the primary street and Station Street the secondary street. The addressing was on Main Street and the secondary side Station Street was up against the commuter parking lot.

Mr. Flubacker stated that the site sloped downward to Station Street six feet, which was a very nominal slope (a 4% grade). It was not a hillside but a significant slope. Parking was required for the project and it met the required formulas. The project was planned to be a mix of business and residential. Mr. Flubacker's schemes met the parking requirements in terms of quantity. At grade it, was the petitioner's intent to put commercial retail, and the next two floors, floors 2 and 3, would be residential--condo units. Below the Main Street level was parking. All parking access would be from Station Street, concurrent with ordinance. Mr. Flubacker felt that the building height of 38 feet should be measured from Station Street. Mr. Flubacker stated that all required setbacks had been met.

Ms. Pokorski clarified the procedure.

Mr. Flubacker listed the four areas he was appealing.

1. Methodology of computing height.
2. Because of the through-lot nature of the site, the project had two first floors, which would affect permitted uses.
3. The exterior on-grade parking at the Station Street end of the site was defined as a "parking structure" rather than on-grade parking.
4. The building did not have 2 first floors, but a properly defined basement, and it was not a "parking structure."
5. When the basement was considered a basement, the gross square footage did not exceed 25,000 gsf.

Mr. Wallace mentioned calculation of area. These four areas cause a change in methodology of calculating the building height.

Mr. Flubacker presented some visual interpretations, which showed ways to measure the height of a building. Mr. Flubacker said that the center case of exhibit applied.

Mr. Flubacker discussed each of the points. Mr. Flubacker thought ordinance was clear, average predevelopment grade on a through lot, the reference, whichever yields a greater building height. It was measured from top most grade from Main Street. Mr. Flubacker thought it should be measured from Station Street.

Mr. Flubacker then addressed the question as to whether the project had two first floors. Mr. Flubacker did not feel there was any precedent for this interpretation. Mr. Flubacker did not feel that the ordinance had that language. The project had one floor over the other. The first floor was on Main Street.

Mr. Flubacker called attention to Exhibit 4.3 with regard to parking, which was at rear of building. It was, in fact, on-grade parking. Mr. Flubacker referred to the BOCA Code definitions, and then he displayed pictures of three other buildings with covered parking, which were not considered to be parking structures/garages but on-grade parking. Mr. Flubacker further stated that BOCA had certain criteria for the basement. Mr. Flubacker felt the basement in the proposed project met all requirements for a basement.

Mr. Wallace presented his interpretation. Mr. Wallace stated that both parties agreed on some things. One area of discussion was the concept of front and rear. Both parties agreed that Main Street was busier than Station Street. However, a through lot, in the Zoning Ordinance said that were two front yards. Therefore, it was inaccurate to refer to one as a front and the other, the rear.

In regards to the height issue, Mr. Flubacker and Mr. Wallace disagreed on the building height. Mr. Wallace stated that Craig Failor, the former Senior Planner, wrote the ordinance. As part of the planning staff, Mr. Wallace knew the intent of the ordinance. The key word was the yield reference, and whichever yields a greater height. Mr. Wallace said it meant whatever creates it was the intent. This was a specific amendment to determine the height on sloped lots and to measure everything from the low side so the Village of Barrington will not have problems with those buildings, which abut the low lots. The key word was yields, not permits, a greater height.

Mr. Wallace said that regarding the two first stories. Mr. Wallace admitted that the Zoning Ordinance did not do a good job of addressing this matter. However, Mr. Wallace was not comfortable using BOCA to address Zoning Ordinance issues. The BOCA talks about safety code, and zoning ordinances were about streetscapes and aesthetics, and Mr. Wallace urged caution when drawing comparisons. Mr. Wallace said that the same words used in both have completely different meanings. The intent of zoning was to restrict streetscapes. This ordinance treated both sides as equally important and did not reflect primary and secondary streets. Mr. Wallace thought that the front of Station Street should have the same, not a different, first story experience. This was the language for the B-4 district.

Mr. Wallace discussed that the parking structure was the fourth issue with the definition of parking garage. Mr. Wallace stated that it had a roof over it with columns. Mr. Wallace looked at whether the area was open or closed to determine whether it was a parking structure. It had a roof over it, was supported by columns, and was enclosed. Mr. Wallace stated what made it different from a parking area was that it was part of the bulk of the mass of the building. Mr. Wallace believed very strongly it was a parking structure. Mr. Wallace said he could not address the material presented by the petitioner, as this was the first time he had seen it, and it was in much more detail than before.

Mr. Flubacker talked about the definition of front and rear yards. The ordinance required that the first floor must have permitted uses only. Mr. Flubacker stated that first floor uses were required on two floors. The petitioner had these two sides treated as fronts with the correct frontage on both sides. Mr. Flubacker thought they had done what was required. Mr. Flubacker felt that it meant both floors needed to be defined as retail. Mr. Flubacker did not think it was addressed in any hearing about having two floors retail.

Mr. Flubacker then discussed the height requirement as stated in the ordinance. It was a six-foot difference between the two sides. Mr. Flubacker asked why not just have a sentence that said "measure from the lowest point" in the Zoning Ordinance.

The petitioner then talked about the parking and stated that there were no building code requirements for part of the egress route. Cars parked on it and it was an aisle way. It was on-grade parking not a parking structure. It could be asphalt; it did not fall under the definition. Mr. Flubacker felt that in order to be a parking structure, it must meet building codes. Mr. Flubacker then asked what if there were grass or gravel, instead of concrete, would it be considered part of the building. There were different sizes of cantilever. The fact, that there were cars did not make it a parking structure. With regard to the interior parking—by code it was defined as a basement. Mr. Flubacker

then talked about exclusivity and stated that electrical use was necessary for parking. There might also be waste receptacles for refuse.

**Chuck Crook, 293 Rose Terrace, Lake Forest**, stated that he had been a zoning official. Mr. Crook felt that with regard to the height issue, there was an easy way to word the requirement and felt that the ordinance should state it clearly. Mr. Crook understood the treatment of the two fronts, and the pedestrian friendly environment, and carries that through to Station Street. Mr. Crook felt this was a good ordinance, and up to date, and that ordinances had to meet many situations. Mr. Crook felt it did have some gray area. With the issue of counting the underground parking as a parking structure, it would force the petitioner to create a much smaller building than they had planned. The petitioner was limited to 25,000 sq. ft. By counting underground area as part of the building, it would have to be 25 or 30 percent smaller. If the petitioner did not provide the parking, they could have a larger building.

***Public Comment:***

**Jeff Westergard**, a local resident of 15 years, who was also an investor and developer, had worked on project for nine months. Mr. Westergard stated one of the petitioner's intentions was to request a variance to have residential on first floor because it would not be prudent to have commercial in the back. Mr. Westergard stated the petitioner wanted to build a building that was fully compliant with all building codes. The petitioner's intent was to build something and not create problems. Mr. Westergard stated that the Architectural Review Commission was in favor of the project and had complimented Mr. Flubacher on his project. He said the law was the law, and they wanted to abide by it; however, with some of these things, they had a hard time making decisions.

Mr. Sbiral stated that the 25,000-square footage was not a requirement; however if it were more than 25,000 square feet, it would be a planned development. Mr. Sbiral suggested that the Zoning Board of Appeals go down the points in question and make a recommendation on each one.

Ms. Pokorski said there were a lot of different areas of expertise with architects, engineers, and each was looking at the different areas, and this was a very complex issue. Ms. Pokorski stated that she was the representative lawyer on the panel. Zoning ordinances could not be drafted to cover every situation, and that the Zoning Board of Appeals interpreted those situations that were not covered. Ms. Pokorski was glad that Architectural Review Commission supported the project, but the Zoning Board of Appeals had a different job. It was a legal job dealing with such items as square footage, etc. There was an ordinance, and the Zoning Board of Appeals had to make a decision within confines of that ordinance. Ms. Pokorski stated that this was the first item on which the Zoning Board of Appeals had an interpretation within the last 19 months. Usually the cases the Zoning Board of Appeals heard were those requesting a variance.

Ms. Pokorski said she was not aware of anything that set out rules for tests of interpretation. Ms. Pokorski said one could look at the four corners, what were the words and if it was not clear from that, then you looked at secondary sources, for the intent. This was called parole evidence, that which was not included, but might be in another document or a letter that stated intent. The Zoning Board of Appeals would then try to make determination. If, as Mr. Wallace or Mr. Flubacker stated, the ordinance was not clear on these issues, the Zoning Board of Appeals was in a position to ask questions, and then apply common sense as to what it meant.

Mr. Flubacker disagreed and said that these issues were stated in the four corners of the document.

Ms. Pokorski said that if there were two interpretations; then it was not clear, and the Zoning Board of Appeals was in charge of making that determination, and that its decision was final except for legal recourse.

Mr. Julian stated that in the calculation of building height, the board would look in code at definition of the vertical measurement.

Ms. Pokorski cited the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Pokorski said that it did not say it was the applicant's choice where to commence measurement. Ms. Pokorski stated it does not say whichever the applicant chose or the applicant's choice, it stated that whichever makes up the greatest height was the building height.

Mr. Julian said there was a choice between 1, 2, or 3. Mr. Julian said it was a 3.

Ms. Pokorski said that Mr. Flubacker had stated in his remarks that he was able choose.

Mr. Julian said it was not a choice; it was a definition.

Mr. Flubacker said it was measured from the front or rear.

Ms. Moston asked where the Zoning Ordinance said that the petitioner was able to choose the point where measurement commenced.

Mr. Flubacker thought he chose the point of commencement.

Ms. Moston said the Zoning Ordinance picked.

Mr. Henehan said it was selected by mathematics, and that it was determined by picking out the biggest yield.

Mr. Flubacker said that the slope drove it down.

Mr. Julian said it was for community and what it expected to see. The community expected to see no height greater than 38 feet; and there was no bonus if one was on sloped lot. There were some limitations.

Mr. Julian said that a through lot has two fronts, from a community standpoint and a pedestrian standpoint it fit the ordinance. That was not the streetscape. The Zoning Board of Appeals' mission was to represent community. In the end, the Zoning Board of Appeals made the decision.

Ms. Pokorski stated she was not confused by the phrase "yields," she thought that the building height issue was pretty clear.

Mr. Flubacker asked how it would be measured.

Mr. Henehan explained by drawing attention to the illustration again. The determination of front or rear was mathematics, measure from the rear because it yielded a taller net height. On a through lot, the petitioner did not have options, you were automatically on number 3, front or rear options.

Mr. Sbiral said it is a two-step process.

Mr. Crook offered a thought, that if it was a mathematical answer, he thought the ordinance was missing the phrase yields greater height, and that it would be much clearer to say that it in direct words, such as measure a shorter height on the tallest side of building to clarify the intent of community.

Mr. Henehan gave an example of measuring from the shorter side.

Ms. Perille gave an example of a house that was not located on a through lot. Ms. Perille stated that there was an extra restriction on those buildings located on a through lot.

Ms. Pokorski stated those examples were in place before the ordinance was adopted, and they were grandfathered. Ms. Pokorski also said that on a through lot one could not have a building on either side that is taller than 38 feet.

Mr. Sbiral suggested that board members ask specific questions.

Ms. Pokorski asked for a motion to either find with petitioner or the Zoning Official.

MOTION: Mr. Henehan moved to find height the measurement would be from position as stated by the Zoning Official. Mr. Julian seconded. Roll called noted the following: Patricia Pokorski, Chair, yes; Ralph Bartlett, yes;

Robert Henehan, yes; Ryan Julian yes; Bruce Kramer, yes; Victoria Perille, yes; and Peg Moston, yes. Motion carried.

The next issue was the issue of the building having two different first stories. Mr. Wallace stated that as perceived from Main Street, there was a different first story than that of the Station Street first story.

Ms. Pokorski said it was cumbersome and asked whether there could there be two first stories.

Ms. Pokorski said that there was retail level on Main Street, and there was a first floor parking level on station Street

Mr. Sbiral showed a picture to help determine what the first floor was. On Main Street there was retail and on Station the first floor was the parking level. The question for the Zoning Board of Appeals was interpreting the drawing.

Mr. Flubacker suggested they refer to his drawing, Exhibit 3-1. The dark shaded area was what was perceived from Main Street, and the bottom area was what would be seen from Station Street.

Mr. Flubacker said he did not think it could have two floors, and it did not matter that it was a through lot.

Mr. Henehan said it was because of the different slopes.

Mr. Julian said intent of ordinance, that on a through lot there was a difference, depending of which side you walk into the building and here just a half block made a difference which floor you entered. To Mr. Julian, the first floor on Main Street, the darkest gray, and the other gray, vaulted, was the first floor, and it began on Main Street and continued to Station Street. The wall separated the parking area. The first floor did not change.

Ms. Pokorski asked if someone were to enter from Station Street how would they enter the building.

Mr. Flubacker said a person would enter through parking area and use elevator or climb the stairs.

Mr. Henehan said it was just a walkway. It was greater than 33% than the floor below.

Mr. Julian stated it could be labeled as Ground and 2.

Mr. Flubacker said it triggers required uses on the first floor.

Mr. Flubacker said that uses of both floors had to be permitted uses and parking was not permitted.

Mr. Wallace stated project might need variations, or be developed as planned development.

Ms. Pokorski said there might be two first floors, and it might not make sense to say it had to be retail if it was in a basement. If the Zoning Board of Appeals determines that there are two first floors, there might be different uses.

Mr. Flubacker asked where the Zoning Board of Appeals would find the answer to this. Mr. Flubacker stated that if these findings were upheld the project would have to be a planned development.

Ms. Perille said she would agree with Mr. Flubacker and that the ordinance said that first floor uses were certain uses, and that the pedestrian experience with building and grade level uses.

Mr. Julian stated that the number of a floor does not change from one side to another. As you looked at the two streets, there were two first floors. The Village has these ordinances which made the building more accessible and the Village wanted citizens to have same experience. Mr. Julian thought there were two first floors, A and B. There was one on Station Street and one on Main Street if the building was built this way.

Ms. Pokorski clarified that on Station Street a person entering the building would have to walk up to level of Main Street.

Ms. Moston said it was confusing because it was a half a floor.

Mr. Bartlett replied that the ordinance said one looks at it from the streetscape and that looking at it from the Station Street side, the first story was parking and on Main Street, it was retail.

Ms. Moston said in the back one had to go up or go down to the first floor.

Mr. Bartlett said if the Zoning Board of Appeals interpreted the Zoning Ordinance as the staff had, it would have to be special use for the second floor. When Mr. Bartlett looked at building at ground level, it was parking which was first floor.

Mr. Wallace clarified process that he and petitioner should respond to questions from the Zoning Board of Appeals and not make more points.

Ms. Pokorski said she agreed with what Mr. Bartlett said and that the first floor was the ground level no matter what you called it or what its use was and suggested the petitioner obtain a variance not to use first level of Station Street for retail.

Ms. Perille said it was a permitted use.

Mr. Sbiral said it should probably be a planned use development.

Mr. Flubacker said that not if the total footage was more than 25,000, and that board got to parking structure question, then it might trigger the over 25,000 square footage and would make it be a planned development.

**MOTION:** In relation to the summary Point #3 of October 22, second sentence.

Mr. Bartlett moved to support the findings of staff that the first floor was retail on Main Street and the first floor was parking on Station Street. Mr. Julian seconded.

Roll Call noted the following: Patricia Pokorski, Chair, yes; Ralph Bartlett, yes; Robert Henehan, yes; Ryan Julian yes; Bruce Kramer, yes; Victoria Perille, yes; and Peg Moston, no. Motion carried.

The next issue was regarding No. 3 that Parking Structures were not permitted.

Ms. Pokorski noted that a Planned Development was required for any project greater than 25,000 feet. The Zoning Board of Appeals would consider Points 4, 5, and 6 in October memo re: the columns supporting the roof.

Ms. Pokorski clarified to Mr. Flubacker that the columns were for the purpose of circulation. On-site parking was indicated.

Mr. Flubacker said when someone enters the parking garage, that was parking lot not a structure the two floors above it were residential floors.

Ms. Pokorski said she thought it was incredulous that Mr. Flubacker thought this point was irrelevant. Mr. Flubacker had designed a building around a parking lot.

Ms. Perille asked a question as to how the Zoning Board of Appeals would review the 25,000 limit on square footage as presented in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Sbiral clarified that the buildings shown on display were built before this ordinance was adopted. Mr. Sbiral then read the new ordinance and the definitions. Mr. Sbiral called attention to No. 3 in the display for further clarification.

Ms. Pokorski cautioned Zoning Board of Appeals not to get hung up on the word “exclusively.” Parking areas always have ancillary uses.

Mr. Henehan said that meant it was portioned off for an exclusive parking area if it was striped.

Mr. Bartlett asked Mr. Sbiral asked if there was a definition for a parking lot and/or parking garage/parking structure.

Mr. Sbiral stated that a parking lot was the same as on grade parking.

Parking lot would be an open area according to Mr. Bartlett and would not be enclosed.

Ms. Pokorski read part of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Julian thought it could be open or closed, but the proposal looked like a structure to him.

Mr. Flubacker said the project could not make it under the square footage requirement and still comply with the code. This parking area was an outdoor asphalt area under the cover of a roof. It was in the open air and unprotected.

Mr. Bartlett said that he looked at it as a structure; it was built to house automobiles and had columns to support other aspects of buildings.

Mr. Flubacker said if he had ramps that would make it a parking garage with different levels. There were things inside that were incidental uses. Mr. Flubacker asked whether it was a basement or parking in a basement. Parking was on the exterior of the building and should be considered an on-grade parking lot.

Mr. Bartlett asked that if the area used for parking had a concrete floor, would that be interpreted as part of the structure.

Mr. Wallace stated in his opinion that it was not the floor, but the enclosure that made it a structure, it was an enclosed parking structure and that he differentiated between buildings and structure.

Mr. Henehan said his feeling were that if cars were parked inside with stripes it would be called parking.

Mr. Julian said he thought the gray area was a structure. Mr. Julian said it was either a parking structure or not. Mr. Julian felt that it should either count it all or not count it at all.

Ms. Pokorski said the staff considered the parking entry as part of a parking structure; it had a ceiling, and thus the definition must include the parking structure in the square footage of the building.

Mr. Wallace said that the area with the parking spaces and in between columns was an enclosed parking structure.

Mr. Flubacker stated that it was a parking area. The roof above was part of the building.

Mr. Julian asked if there were cantilevers above.

Mr. Wallace said that it would then be parking area. The Zoning Ordinance is broad; it does not specify. In the absence of a cantilever over grade, it would be parking area not a structure.

Ms. Perille said the difference was that other examples presented had no parking area next to them. The existence of adjacent interior walls, and the appearance of the structure include it all. If it were a stand alone parking lot, a



person would enter on a grade level in order to access other areas. Even when a person was on grade level; that person was in the garage.

Ms. Pokorski agreed.

**MOTION:** Mr. Julian moved to accept the definition that would include the first 30 feet of parking area as a parking structure including the open area; and to also include those parking spaces in the basement as part of the parking structure.

For clarification, Mr. Sbiral pointed out that board members were referring to Exhibit 3.1A-8 and the definition of a parking structure.

There was further discussion:

Mr. Henehan suggested that anything that was designated for parking should be counted as part of parking structure.

Mr. Flubacker asked Mr. Wallace for his interpretation of the three buildings shown in his display.

Mr. Wallace said he thought that two of them would be considered structures. The bottom one was a structure designed for parking. The one on top right was questionable, and Mr. Wallace would need more detail. The one on top left was troublesome, because it met the definition; it had columns, and parking structures were strictly regulated in B-4.

Mr. Flubacker said he thought that the parking structure in his example would require a variation. Mr. Flubacker was trying to get an understanding of what was acceptable.

Mr. Sbiral said that the structure in Mr. Flubacker's example would be an accessory use and that the parking was accessory. Stand alone parking was a special use.

Mr. Wallace said he would interpret the clause conservatively.

Mr. Flubacker said he needed definitions or rules to follow.

Ms. Perille asked what was a parking structure or a basement with parking. In this case, most of it had been designated for parking.

Ms. Pokorski said that she had not read anything in the Zoning Ordinance about the quantity of parking required.

Mr. Julian noted to include in the motion that the drive aisles should be counted as part of the parking structure within the building.

Ms. Moston clarified that a person has entered the building when using the drive aisles.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Henehan moved that the portion of the lower level that was used exclusively for parking would count toward square footage and this would include space that was used within structure for aisle, the white and light gray areas shown in the exhibit. Mr. Julian seconded the motion.

Roll Call recorded the following: Patricia Pokorski, Chair, yes; Ralph Bartlett, no; Robert Henehan, yes; Ryan Julian yes; Bruce Kramer, yes; Victoria Perille, yes; and Peg Moston, yes. Motion carried.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MOTION: Mr. Julian moved to approve minutes of Draft minutes of December 3 meeting. Mr. Kramer seconded. All ayes were recorded.

**PLANNER'S REPORT**

Mr. Sibal stated that he had not received any petitions thus far for the March meeting and it may be canceled.

**ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Mr. Bartlett moved to adjourn; Mr. Henahan seconded. All ayes. Meeting adjourned. At 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

---

Patricia Pokorski, Chairperson  
Zoning Board of Appeals